


COURTS IN GREENLEE COUNTY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN 2014-2016 SUMMARY



LOCAL INITIATIVES, DRIVERS, AND PRESSURES

- Reduce travel and cost required to obtain COJET training; provide on-site training room.
- Reduce high cost of contracting court reporters by joining statewide remote court reports project.
- Obtain offsite access to court records for key personnel (for telework and business continuity).
- Better preserve audio court records over time.
- Work with county justice partners to eliminate re-keying of criminal data and improve accuracy.
- Electronically distribute minute entries and provide electronic access to requested documents.
- Enhance physical security within superior court building, especially for staff.
- Provide Greenlee-specific court forms on county website.

CY 2011/12 ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Began providing electronic files to visiting judges.
- Obtained market adjustment from county to assist in retaining court employees.
- Reached out to public through column in local newspaper written by presiding judge.
- Began e-mailing requests for court reporter coverage to Arizona Court Reporters Association to increase resource availability.
- Obtained new JOLTS coordinator for county.

Statewide Projects: Impacts, Concerns, and Participation Plans

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| LJ CMS | Positive about reduction in manual keying and increase of data exchange possibilities; require equipment and training; will be early adopter (but little LJ input to plan). |
| JOLTSaz e-Filing/Std Forms | Have new JOLTS coordinator; will be mid-cycle adopter. Recognize savings in clerk labor and paper; will improve filings from out-of-county attorneys; will be mid cycle adopter. |
| LJ EDMS | Will relieve courts' physical records storage pressures; will reduce time to fill requests; will be early adopters (but little LJ input to plan). |
| Bench Auto | Necessitates new equipment and judge training but saves paper, printer ink, and staff time; will be mid-cycle adopters. |
| Architecture | Don't perform local development; a few items are in containment status. |

| TECHNOLOGY PROJECTS | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Project | Year/ Status | Project Detail Provided | | | Comments |
| | | Full¹ | Skeletal² | Mention³ | |
| Self-Service Center | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court Clerk |
| Courthouse Security | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court building |
| Improve Courtroom Audio, Video, & Evidence Presentation | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court; Exhibit One |
| Electronic Minute Entries | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court Clerk |
| Complete Local Court Website | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court; County IT |
| Remote Court Reporters | FY13 | | X | | Participate in statewide project to solve local shortage |
| Local Training Room | FY13 | | X | | Reduce travel time/cost; enable video training |
| Preserve Audio Records | FY13 | | X | | Superior Court Clerk |
| Data Exchange/ Interface Programs | FY13 | | X | | All courts/Local justice partners |
| Improve Access to e-Records | FY15 | | X | | Key court personnel |
| FTR Expansion / Backup | FY15 | | X | | Superior Court |
| Courtroom Wi-Fi Access | FY14 | | X | | Superior Court |
| Judge Scanning System | FY16 | | X | | Superior court; out-of-county documents |

Note 1:

An “X” in “Full” indicates that the court has provided full detailed information about the project according to the general parameters outlined in the Commission on Technology’s Project Management Methodology. Also, risk analysis, impact, project costs and funding information has been provided.

Note 2:

An “X” in “Skeletal” indicates that the court provided detail about the local project in the master projects listing spreadsheet. Complete information, usually risks, impact analysis, project costs and funding, was not provided.

Note 3:

An “X” in “Mention” indicates that the court mentioned this project in a summary or listed it in an initiative. It may have been a phrase or a full paragraph of description, but did not contain detailed project-oriented information. If these projects are related to pursuing standards or directions already adopted (e.g., OnBase EDMS implementation, Jury+ upgrade, digital audio in the courtroom), then any mention which includes appropriate funding information is sufficient.